

DEC 05 2006

Filed: March 25, 2004

Serial No. 10/809,278
Amendment and Response to
Office Action mailed July 5, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 15-42 are pending in the present application. Claims 15, 16, 17, 21, 25, 27, and 29-32 have been amended. In addition, Claims 34-42 have been newly added to claim additional subject matter included in the application. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the pending Claims is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the Claims and the following remarks.

The 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Claim Rejections

Claims 9-12, 14-15 and 27-33 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0078752 to Johnson. (hereinafter "Johnson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,076 to Chang et al. (hereinafter "Chang"). In addition, Claim 13 was rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson, in view of Chang, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0143885 to Ross. (hereinafter "Ross"). Also, Claims 16-20 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson, in view of Chang, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0004922 A1 to Lahti et al. (hereinafter "Lahti"). Further, Claims 21-26 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Chang, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0120496 A1 to Alfred et al. (hereinafter "Alfred"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections since each and every limitation provided in amended Claims 15-33 are not taught, suggested, or disclosed by the cited references either alone or in combination. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

For example, amended Claim 15 describes said first application storing said email message and data related to receipt of said email message in a predetermined reception box folder associated with said first application when said email message is determined to be compatible with said first application, and said first application storing said email message and data related to receipt of said email message in a folder designated within said email message and associated with said second application when said email message is determined to be compatible with said second application. None of the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, teaches, suggests, or discloses a first application storing an email message in a predetermined reception box folder associated with said first application or in a folder designated with said email message and associated with said second application as described in Claim 15.

Serial No. 10/809,278
Amendment and Response to
Office Action mailed July 5, 2006

Filed: March 25, 2004

To the contrary, Johnson is wholly devoted to a browser window for displaying previously downloaded emails on a mobile information device. (paragraphs 36, 40, and Fig. 1) Johnson also describes that various folders may be accessed and documents or document identifiers located therein may be accessed and displayed. (paragraph 58) Johnson also describes an email circuit, routine or application (655) on the mobile information device that enables emails to be read and written, and a document view circuit routine or application (660) that enables mobile information device documents to be viewed. (paragraph 92) An email is received and stored in memory. (paragraph 96) Information, such as an attachment or a datastring can be extracted from an email and stored in a database. (paragraph 96) The datastring may be inserted into the email in place of an attachment electronic document by an access server system before the email is sent to the mobile information device if the mobile information device is unable to process the attachment. (paragraphs 108-110) Chang, describes emails that include electronic attachments and software to open the electronic attachments. (Col. 1 lines 33-42) Accordingly, what neither Johnson nor Chang teach or suggest is a first application storing an email message and data related to receipt of the email message in a predetermined reception box folder associated with said first application or in a folder designated with said email message and associated with a second application.

In another example, amended Claim 21 describes a method that includes generating an email message with said second application that includes a header and an email address of a recipient of the email message, and with said second application enabling said first application to transmit said email message to said recipient via said email server. Neither Johnson nor Chang, either alone or in combination, describe first and second applications executable on a communication terminal to generate email messages. Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion on page 3 of the advisory action mailed October 11, 2006 that either Johnson or Chang describe generating an email message. To the contrary, both Johnson and Chang describe applications that can open attachments included with an email, or, in the case of Johnson, view a received email with a document viewer circuit (660), but are completely silent on generation of an email.

Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion on page 3 of the advisory action mailed October 11, 2006 that Johnson's document viewer circuit (660) "broadly reads on a second application executable on a communication terminal to generate email messages" since Johnson makes quite clear that the document viewer circuit (660) is simply for document viewing as the

Serial No. 10/809,278
Amendment and Response to
Office Action mailed July 5, 2006

Filed: March 25, 2004

name indicates. "[T]he document viewer circuit, routine or application 660 enables a user of the mobile information device to view mobile information device-enabled documents." (paragraph 92) As further indicated on page 3 of the advisory action mailed October 11, 2006, Applicant acknowledges that Johnson also describes that a user can "access" an email with the document viewer circuit. However, not only is access to an email entirely different from generation of an email, but also an email can only be accessed if the email is already in existence and hence was previously generated. Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion in either Johnson or Chang that an email is generated by a second application as described in Claim 21, and clearly neither Johnson nor Chang teach or suggest generating an email message that includes a header and an email address of a recipient of the email message as also described in Claim 21. Further, neither Johnson nor Chang teach or suggest a second application enabling said first application to transmit said email message to said recipient via an email server as also described in Claim 21.

In still another example, amended Claim 27 describes that said second email application is configured to enable said first email application to transmit an email message, to a designated recipient, that is generated for transmission with only said second email application, to include a header and an email address of said designated recipient of said email message. Clearly, neither Johnson nor Chang teach or suggest enabling a first email application to transmit an email message generated for transmission with only said second email application as described in Claim 27. In addition, neither Johnson nor Chang teach or suggest that said email is generated to include a header and an email address of said designated recipient of said email message as further described in Claim 27.

Also, none of the cited references either alone or in combination teach or suggest each and every limitation described in new Claims 34-42.

Serial No. 10/809,278
Amendment and Response to
Office Action mailed July 5, 2006

Filed: March 25, 2004

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, the presently pending Claims 15-42 are patentable over the references of record. Accordingly, with this amendment and remarks, Applicant believes that Claims 15-42 are allowable, and respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowance for this application. Should the Examiner deem a telephone conference to be beneficial in expediting allowance/examination of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Sanders N. Hillis
Attorney for Applicant
Attorney Reg. No. 45,712

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
CUSTOMER NO. 00757
Telephone: 317-636-0886
Facsimile: 317-634-6701